

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:
SHELLEY L. COUTURIER
SCIENTIFIC-ATLANTA, INC.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT. (4.3.517)
5030 SUGARLOAF PARKWAY
LAWRENCEVILLE, GA 30044

RECEIVED
JUN 06 2005
PCT
SCIENTIFIC-ATLANTA, INC.
LEGAL DEPARTMENT

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

Deadline 8/3/05

		Date of Mailing (day/month/year)	03 JUN 2005
Applicant's or agent's file reference F-8621-PC		REPLY DUE	within 2 months/days from the above date of mailing
International application No.	International filing date (day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)	
PCT/US03/33686	22 October 2003 (22.10.2003)	31 March 2003 (31.03.2003)	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC			
IPC(7): H04N 7/173, H04N 7/16 and US Cl.: 725, 91, 100, 105, 114, 116, 117, 127, 131, 139, 151			
Applicant SCIENTIFIC-ATLANTA, INC.			

1. This written opinion is the first (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.

2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- I Basis of the opinion
- II Priority
- III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- IV Lack of unity of invention
- V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2 (a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- VI Certain documents cited
- VII Certain defects in the international application
- VIII Certain observations on the international application

3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension. See rule 66.2(d).

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4. For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis. For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.

4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 22 February 2006 (22.02.2006)

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US Mail Stop PCT, Ann: IPEA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230	Authorized officer KRISTA BUI Telephone No. 571-272-2791
--	--

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet)(July 1998)

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/US03/33686

I. Basis of the opinion1. With regard to the elements of the international application:^{*}

- the international application as originally filed
- the description:
pages 1-18 _____, as originally filed
pages NONE _____, filed with the demand
pages NONE _____, filed with the letter of _____
- the claims:
pages 19-23 _____, as originally filed
pages NONE _____, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
pages NONE _____, filed with the demand
pages NONE _____, filed with the letter of _____
- the drawings:
pages 1-12 _____, as originally filed
pages NONE _____, filed with the demand
pages NONE _____, filed with the letter of _____
- the sequence listing part of the description:
pages NONE _____, as originally filed
pages NONE _____, filed with the demand
pages NONE _____, filed with the letter of _____

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

- the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:

- contained in the international application in printed form.
- filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- the description, page NONE _____
- the claims, Nos. NONE _____
- the drawings, sheets/fig NONE _____

5. This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(e)).

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed."

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/US03/33686**V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement****1. STATEMENT**

Novelty (N) Claims 15-24 _____ YES
 Claims 1-14 _____ NO

Inventive Step (IS) Claims NONE _____ YES
 Claims 1-14 _____ NO

Industrial Applicability (IA) Claims 1-24 _____ YES
 Claims NONE _____ NO

2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Claims 1-14 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Gordon et al. (US patent pub 2002/0066101 A1).

Regarding claims 1-7 and 8-14, Gordon teaches a network multimedia system for receiving a plurality of presentations from a communications network, the network comprising a plurality of receiving devices including a primary device and a plurality of remote devices for providing a network guide, i.e., a program guide, and the primary device retrieving information from the plurality of receiving devices and storing the retrieved information for providing with past and present information as well as filtering information or blocking undesired information (Gordon, Figs. 1, 2A, 4-6, and page 2, par. 0028-page 3, par. 0036 for IPG information and interactive program guide system, including a head end primary device as shown in Figure 1 in retrieving information from a plurality of remote devices for later on providing appropriate or requested information to remote devices for past and present information, refer to page 9, par 0100 to par. 0109) and filtering technique is addressed, refer to page 11, par. 0130 to par. 0134 for filtering and customization).

Claims 15-24 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a network multimedia system for receiving contents, wherein the system includes a splitter/isolation module for receiving content signals and for providing content signals; and a plurality of receiving devices each coupled to the splitter/isolation module as claimed in claim 15.

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/US03/33686

Supplemental Box
(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

TIME LIMIT:

The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.